

## REMARKS

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action the Examiner requested formal drawings in accordance with the accepted drawing corrections filed on February 5, 2003. Formal Drawings are attached hereto. The prime on the second bevel (26') has been put on the correct side of the numeral. It is therefore requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn and the correction to the drawings not be held in abeyance.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to the specification because of the inclusion of both bevels (26 and 26') in the "bottom area" of the arm (15, 115). This paragraph has been amended to recite that bevel 26 is "in the area external to said input arm (17) and a second bevel (26') located on at least one side of said arm (15, 115) between said first bevel (26) and said wheel hub (13)". The first full paragraph on page 6 has also been rewritten to more accurately point out the location of bevel 26 and bevel 26'. It is therefore requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1,3 and 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to specifically recite "a first bevel (26) located on at least one side of said arm (15, 115) in the area external to said input arm (17) and a second bevel (26') located on at least one side of said arm (15, 115) between said first bevel (26) and said wheel hub (13)". The language that suggested that the first bevel (26) was in the bottom area of the arm has been deleted. It is therefore requested that the §112, second paragraph rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sonnleitner et al. (DE 19908958 A1, hereinafter "Sonnleitner") in view of Wildey (United States Pat. No. 4,064,956, hereinafter "Wildey"). (Claim 4 has been cancelled and therefore the rejection thereto is rendered moot).

Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct the discrepancy the Examiner highlighted regarding the location of the two bevels. The phrase "at least two" bevels has been inserted into claim 1. Additionally, the phrase "external to said input arm" has been added to further describe the location of the second bevel (26) as being in a position beyond the extension of the input shaft (17) and first bevel gear system (19, 20). Support for these amendments can be found in Figs. 1-4 and the amended paragraph beginning on line 4 of page 6 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

The disclosure in Sonnleitner, as Applicant understands it, teaches an engine half trolley without bevels, whereas bevels are claimed features in the present application. The Examiner states that Sonnleitner "shows the casing (8) in schematic representation, and as such fails to disclose the claimed casing including the bevels in the claimed location." Applicant respectfully responds that Sonnleitner does not disclose or suggest the use of bevels on the arm (15, 115) which forms a part of the casing, and more importantly, not as claimed and described in the present application. In particular, Applicant respectfully argues that Sonnleitner fails to disclose the claimed casing including the bevels in the claimed location, not because "the casing is shown in schematic," but rather because these features do not form any part of the invention disclosed in Sonnleitner.

With regard to Wildey, there is no disclosure in Wildey which teaches the use of at least two bevels in the casing, at the locations claimed in the present application. The Examiner states that: "Wildey teaches a casing (38) for an

engine half trolley including a bevel (at 110 see Figure 3) in the bottom area of the arm."

The Examiner has labeled as "Bevel A" in Figure 3 of Wildey, what appears to Applicant to be housing 46 of central transfer unit 40. Applicant respectfully points out that the view of housing 46 depicted in Figure 3 shows only one small, apparently sloped, apparently internal surface section of housing 46. This surface is not only internal, but is in a position along the length of the input shaft (76) and its housing which extends at least to the cover (68), and therefore is not containing the structure of the vehicle drive and suspension system of Widley. The bevels of the present invention, specifically, bevel (26) is exterior to the drive shaft, i.e., the drive shaft or housing thereof does not extend past bevel (26) (compare Fig. 3 of Widley and Figs. 3 and 4 of the present invention). This is one of the focuses of the present invention as disclosed in the specification at page 6, lines 11-17, "[t]hese bevels [26, 26'] in the casing 12 reduce the overall dimensions towards the inside of the vehicle and enable the vehicle provided with the said half-trolley 10 to have a greater and easier penetration, above all in muddy terrain and in situations where obstacles may be present". It cannot be shown from the figure that Wildey teaches or suggests bevels at the particular locations claimed in the present application or any other distinct location. In response to the Examiner's specific comments in regards to Applicant's arguments, Applicant highlights that the present invention possesses the multiple bevels in specific locations along the arm, there is no disclosure of at least two bevel at these particular location in Wildey, but rather, two inclined surfaces that are not described as, or claimed to be, bevels in the casing.

Neither of the two cited references, Sonnleitner (as it is understood by Applicant), nor Wildey, provides any

suggestion or motivation to combine their teachings. As stated in Applicant's response to the previous Office Action, Wildey teaches a bogie drive and suspension system with a "coupling 100 compris[ing] a pair of back-to-back flange members 98 connected by a midshaft 128. The flange members have internal teeth 101 formed thereon which mesh with external teeth 103 formed on the midshaft 128" (col. 4, lines 40-44). The invention in Wildey is designed to permit "some rocking movement of the shaft 128 within the flanges 98 to accommodate misalignment of the central and wheel end transfer units due to deflection of the walking beam [38] under load" (col. 4, lines 45-49).

The present application is directed to solving a different problem found in, but not addressed by, the prior art. One of the objects of the present invention is to provide an engine half-trolley with "the number of components limited to the minimum." The benefits of the present invention, over the cited art, provides reduced initial construction costs, reduced repair costs due to inventory storage of additional components, reduced number of components which may break, and a reduced overall size of the engine half-trolley (specification page 2, line 19 to page 3, line 7). The multi-component shaft of the Wildey device does not accomplish these objects, whereas the continuous shaft of the present invention does meet these goals. A further object of the present invention is to provide means for allowing a vehicle that is used in off road applications, to safely and efficiently drive through mud and over rough terrain. The present invention uses, *inter alia*, bevels, in the claimed locations, to provide these advantages over the prior art.

With regard to claims 5-10, these claims are directed toward an embodiment that provides further advantages over the prior art for the passage of the half truck over rough terrain and through mud, for compactness of components, and for

avoiding or minimizing impact with objects. With regard to these claims, Applicant respectfully states that the Examiner has misconstrued the invention disclosed and claimed in claims 5-10. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the "angle of rotation is approximately 15 for the rotating shaft of Sonnleitner et al. as well." The Examiner also marked Figure 4 of Wildey to show an angle  $\beta$ , determined solely by Examiner to be equal to 15. Applicant respectfully states that this angle referenced by the Examiner is not the angle claimed in claims 5-10 of the present invention. The angle described and shown by the Examiner in Figure 4 of Wildey is measured with respect to the ground, or a horizontal plane. The angle described and claimed for, *inter alia*, arm 115 in the present invention is measured, as previously mentioned, with regard to the direction of travel of the vehicle, or in other words, the longitudinal direction. The Examiner has requested support for this contention, and said support can be found in Fig. 4, the specification page 7, lines 4-9, and claims 5-10 as originally filed. As the present disclosure states, the trolleys of the prior art are "of a square shape and present considerable overall dimensions, which lead to difficulties of penetration of the vehicle in muddy and swampy environments." Page 2, lines 14-18. The embodiments disclosed in claims 5-10 relate to the embodiment shown in Figure 4 of the present application, showing the novel arrangement of the arm 115 and shaft 20 at angle  $\beta$  with regard to the longitudinal direction. The specification describes this arrangement and many of the advantages thereof on page 6, line 21 thru page 9, line 20, and in Figure 4.

Applicant respectfully states that neither of the cited art references discloses, suggests or teaches the above-referenced and described features in claims 5-10 of the present invention, including, *inter alia*, shaft 20 and arm 115 set at angle  $\beta$  with respect to the longitudinal direction.

Based on all of the above remarks and arguments, it is respectfully requested that the §103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3 and 5-10 are now allowable over the prior art and that the present application is in proper form for allowance. Reconsideration of these rejections is requested in view of this amendment. An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan  
Registration No.: 25,669

MAILING ADDRESS

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 302-8989

I hereby certify that this  
correspondence is being  
deposited with the United States Postal Service as  
first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 3/26/04  
